

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMENCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	О.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,891		01/16/2004	Paul R. Kayl	P1943US00	6982
24333	7590	03/08/2005		EXAMINER	
GATEW ATTN: So		C. HARLES RICHAR	WILLIAMS, MARK A		
610 GAT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MAIL DE		·	3676		
N. SIOUX	CITY,	SD 57049	DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
$\mathscr{Q}$	10/758,891	KAYL, PAUL R.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark A. Williams	3676				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/7/04 &amp; 1/16/04.</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					

Art Unit: 3676

1

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 2, 15, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not fully understood in the context of the claim language exactly what structure constitutes a "pivot mechanism" and exactly how does this structure differ from the second hinge itself, since a hinge is inherently a pivoting mechanism.

The term "docketing station" is not fully understood in the context of the claim. What structure constitutes the docketing station?

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 3676

À

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 3

4. Claims 1-13 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamikakai, US Patent 6,154,359. An electronic device comprising a notebook computer having a chassis 2 and a lid 3, the chassis containing at least one chassis hinge channel and the lid containing at least one lid hinge channel (see figures 4A, 4B, and 9); at least one first hinge mounted in the one lid hinge channel; at least one second hinge mounted in the at least one chassis hinge channel of the chassis; and at least one connecting member 4 connecting each of the at least one first hinge to each of the at least one second hinge wherein the lid is rotatable substantially 360 degrees from a closed position through a first operative position into a second operative position. As understood, a docking station to which the notebook computer can be connected in a vertical position when the lid is in the second operative position may be used.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3676

ì

6. Claims 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamikakai et al.

Regarding claims 14-16, although two hinge assemblies comprised of two connecting members (connecting each of two first hinges with each of two second hinges) are not shown as claimed, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device in this way, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8. Such a modification is not critical to the design and would have produced no unexpected results.

Regarding claim 17, although use of a mouse is not explicitly taught by Kamikakai, the examiner serves Official Notice that it is highly well known to use a mouse with such an electronic device in a computer application. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one skilled in the art to have included in the design of Kamikakai such a modification, for the purpose of gaining the added known benefit of a mouse in a computer application, as convention in the art.

Regarding claim 18, Kamikakai discloses means for disabling the keyboard, etc., as claimed, but does not specify the claimed pressure switch and orientation.

Art Unit: 3676

ł

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the disabling element of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47. Such limitations are not critical to the design and produce no unexpected results.

Regarding claims 19-21, the claimed separator structure is not shown in Kamikakai. However, the examiner serves Official Notice that well known in the art to use such separating elements for the purpose of buffering contact between surfaces. It would have been obvious at the time the device was made for one skilled in the art to have includes such a modification, for the purpose of buffering contact between the two members.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Williams whose telephone number is (703) 305-3438. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/758,891 Page 6

Art Unit: 3676

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (703) 308-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Williams 3/2/05 mw/

Scanne Dino Barrett Primary Examiner